

Approved Minutes of the Maricopa HOME Consortium

**Public Meeting
August 20, 2015
9:30 a.m.**

Present: Matt Hess, City of Avondale
Barbara Bellamy, City of Chandler
Melissa Vizzerra, City of Chandler
Robert Kropp, Town of Gilbert
Charyn Palmisano, City of Glendale
Buz Essel, City of Glendale
Elizabeth Garcia, City of Glendale
Jaime Gonzalez, City of Peoria
Muriel Gutierrez, City of Surprise (telephonically)
Richard Thomason, HUD
Amy Jacobson, Maricopa County
Carl Morgan, Maricopa County
Carissa Cyr, Maricopa County
Lisa Lowery, Maricopa County
Theresa Fox, Maricopa County
Margaret Kilman, Maricopa County
Regina Marette, Maricopa County

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

At 9:30 a.m., Amy Jacobson called to order the August 20, 2015 Maricopa HOME Consortium Public Meeting held at the Security Building in Classroom 1, Floor 1A, at 234 North Central Ave., Phoenix, Arizona 85004. The Roll was called and a quorum was established.

2. Approval of Minutes (7/16/15)

Amy called for a motion to approve the minutes of the July 16, 2015 monthly HOME Consortium Public Meeting unless there were any changes or corrections to the minutes. Jaime Gonzalez made one correction: City of Peoria was in attendance. Barbara Bellamy motioned to approve the July 16, 2015 Minutes with the one correction. The motion was seconded by Charyn Palmisano and passed unanimously.

3. SHPO Programmatic Agreement

At the last Consortium meeting there was a discussion relating to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) programmatic agreement. The County's intention was to institute a consortium-wide agreement so all the consortium members could utilize the SHPO agreement. There was an interest by the Consortium to include new construction activities in the agreement. Since then, the County has been in contact with the SHPO office regarding new construction, but SHPO has concerns regarding including new construction because of structural variables that new construction entails and also with the archeological division within SHPO regarding soil disturbance. In the County's discussions with SHPO, they have stated that it is unlikely that these issues would not be resolved in a reasonable period of time to be included in the programmatic agreement. The County is willing to work on this and there is always the possibility that if SHPO approves new construction in a city/town's programmatic agreement that the County could amend the County-wide agreement. Carl emphasized that the goal is to get an agreement approved so that the Consortium can start using it soon. At the present, we have AUGF for most rehab activities where members can use the RER and the Appendix A, and move forward. But the stumbling block with the Appendix A at this time is that if a consortium member has an activity involving rehab and it is going to have an impact on the exterior of a structure, then you

have to have a programmatic agreement in place with SHPO or you have to send a letter to SHPO and wait 30 days for a response.

Regarding the City of Glendale's programmatic agreement, Buz said the wording has been all worked out to include new construction. He said he believes the key is that the activity must be on one acre or less or you have to have an archeological study. New construction has a discovery clause in the agreement and it has been approved, but it needs to be approved by City of Glendale legal.

Glendale's agreement is much different than the County's Programmatic Agreement. Charyn stated that the County's agreement is much more specific, and therefore limiting. Charyn said in their communications with SHPO that they made the statement that if the City signs on to the County's agreement, the County's agreement will supersede the City's agreement. Therefore, she said the City of Glendale opposes the County's agreement because she believes it will severely limit the City of Glendale's programs.

Charyn recommends that the City of Glendale shares the language that is finalized in their agreement with the Consortium members and the County, the County develops their own agreement and signs on every City agreement, leaving everyone with the autonomy necessary to implement their programs.

Charyn also recommend that the Consortium invite Bob Frankeburger with SHPO to talk about the programs and have clear communication. Charyn said that Mr. Frankeburger has considered the City of Glendale's agreement as a good model and that the City is willing to share it.

Amy said that the original purpose of the County agreement was to have a document that is easily used and standardized and would be a benefit to the program by saving time, that it would be an area the County would pursue. However, if there are barriers, the County is not tied to this agreement. She agreed that we should invite Mr. Frankeburger to discuss whether to pursue this agreement. Only Avondale, Glendale, Peoria and Tempe have programmatic agreements. Charyn recommended changing the language from stating HOME funds to HUD funds.

Buz said he is more than happy to share and address the different documents of each City. Amy thanked Glendale for their efforts in researching this issue. Amy suggested the Consortium for a subcommittee to determine whether to continue with the County-wide agreement or to have each individual member develop their own. Buz suggested that each City make a list of individual requirements that they would need to have included in the agreement. Amy asked the group how they wanted to proceed. Amy suggested that she, Buz, and Carl schedule a conference call with Mr. Frankenburger when he gets back from vacation so that he can hear what the group is trying to accomplish. Then, we will invite him to the next Consortium meeting. Amy asked if anyone else wanted to be included in the call. Richard Thomason said he wanted to attend the conference call.

4. CAPER FY14/15 and Annual Action Plan (AAP) FY15/16

Carissa said she talked to Kim of Kimlyn Consulting and that half of the members had completed the survey. Carissa said there is a tight time frame and that Kim needs the surveys completed by close of business on Friday. If the deadline is met, Kimlyn will have the drafts back to the members on September 1st. The public comment period will begin September 11th.

Carissa said that she included the AAP tentative schedule in everyone's packet. Amy reminded everyone that this AAP is going to be entered into the eCon Planning Suite, so there may be a learning curve. Amy said that we "back in" to these dates and that she understands everyone has their own individual timeframes, but please try and give us the information as you receive it.

5. Underwriting /Market Study Requirements

Amy said as part of the Current Practices that we are updating and as part of the new Final Rule, HUD requires that each member document that they have performed their own underwriting and financial feasibility for all rental properties and single family new construction. The County is providing more details as to what these requirements should include, for example the different types of risk and how those risks are mitigated in each of our proposals. The County will ask for copies of this information the first year and next year we will just ask for the members to sign off on a certification checklist. When each consortium member submits a set up report, this information, including a signed developer agreement, must be provided so the County can confirm the regulations are being adhered to. Amy said the County is developing a rental development handbook, as well.

6. Program Income/Recaptured Funds-

Regina said she included the new Program Income form in everyone's packet. She said she also has emailed it to everyone. The main difference is that the new form delineates the program income from recapture. With program income, members can use 10% for administrative costs, whereas no administrative costs are allowed with recaptured funds. These reports are due monthly and the County is receipting the funds in IDIS.

7. Standard Current Practices Manual Update-

Carissa said she has a draft manual. The County is still making changes, but we are close to sending it out. She said that we will give members a month to review and then vote on it this fall. There are new sections so be sure to review everything.

8. Homelessness Presentation-

Amy introduced Margaret Kilman, the County's new Homelessness Projects Program Manager. She was invited to share what the County is doing related to homelessness initiatives and strategies and to start a dialogue with the Consortium. Amy said she hopes this will be the beginning of sharing information between the County and the Consortium in the area of homelessness. She said she hopes that eventually the County will be able to align resources with ESG collaborators to make a collective impact on the issue of homelessness. Margaret gave a presentation on the state of homelessness in Maricopa County, coordinated entry, the funders collaborative, current projects (rapid re-housing and permanent supportive housing), and regional goals.

She handed out new demographic information for the last fiscal year which has information on the subpopulations that the County is interested in from a regional perspective and where she feels we can have the biggest impact and ending homelessness through the framework that the Continuum of Care and County partners are working on. The numbers are duplicated within program type.

Margaret ended the presentation with an invitation to the consortium members to share broadly the information presented to their communities. She said the hope is to initiate conversations about what is happening in other parts of the County, what the priorities are, where the County can provide support, and opportunities to collaborate.

9. Program Year Expenditure Update Report-

Lisa said she updated the financials for the entire consortium and it includes the FY2014/2015 through June 30, 2015. She said the Consortium as whole expended approximately \$3.5 for the fiscal year. She handed out each consortium member's financial statement. She said that all of the reimbursements submitted have been processed.

Lisa said to please follow the contracts and submit Requests for Reimbursement monthly. We also want to avoid receiving flags in IDIS, so please submit monthly reimbursements. Amy reported happily that there was no commitment shortfall.

10. Announcements and Information-

Amy announced that the contracts would be on the October 21, 2015 Board of Supervisor's (Board of Supervisors) agenda. She said that the final contracts from the member's would be due September 20th. Amy clarified that the Consortium members' need City Council approval of the contracts to take place prior to the BOS approval. Amy said the contracts should go out August 26th.

Jaime asked for the changes of the contract to be in a word document. Amy said that County would send that document out.

Amy asked Richard to report out any news from HUD, including trainings and regulations. Richard reported that he is not aware of any training at this time. He said he really would like to see more support from the grantee's in regards to what is working in the HOME program, including press releases, information, and pictures. In reference to the grant agreements, he said there was a glitch in Washington, but they are releasing them in batches, but they are forthcoming.

11. Call to the Public-

Call to the Public is an opportunity for the public to address the Consortium concerning a subject that is not on the agenda. Public comment is encouraged. At the conclusion of an open call to the public, individual members of the Consortium may respond to criticism made by those who have addressed the Consortium, may ask staff to review a matter, or may ask that a matter be put on a future agenda. However, members of the Consortium shall not discuss or take legal action on matters raised during an open Call to the Public unless the matters are properly noticed for discussion and legal action. *No response from the public.*

12. Adjournment-

There being no other business, the Chair entertained a motion for adjournment by Barbara Bellamy and seconded by Jaime Gonzalez. The motion was passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:00 a.m. The next scheduled public meeting will be September 17, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,



Regina Marette
Recording Secretary